UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,921	12/04/2000	Yumi Wakita	MTS-3226US	1348

7590 09/16/2004

Ratner & Prestia
Suite 301
One Westlakes Berwyn P O Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER	
OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	6

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/701,921	Applicant(s)	
	Examiner Michael N. Opsasnick	Art Unit 2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 May 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 12-14* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *10 and 11* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4,5*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from a multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim 14 has not been further treated on the merits.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As per dependent claim 10, the prior art of record does not explicitly teach the semantic coding section in relation to the morphological analyzing section, as claimed in claim 10. Claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record because it depends from claim 10, which has been determined to be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: The word "clastering" is a misspelling of clustering. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "hereinafter, such a sentence.....target language sentence" in claim 1 lines 7-10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Furthermore, it is not clear as to what "such a sentence" is referring to. For the purposes of art-related examination, this claim language will not be treated on the merits.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As per claim 2, the phrase "(referred to as style-independent phrase)" is vague and indefinite because it is not clear as to what is the subject of "referred". For the purposes of art-related examination, this claim language will not be treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 6-9,12,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kutsumi et al (5353221).

As per claim 6, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"a language transference rule" as using semantic analysis (Fig. 2, L4) for translation (abstract);

"a parallel-translation corpus" as parallel comparison (Fig. 9, subblock S3)

"a phrase extracting section.....phrase" as determining part of speech (fig. 10, subblock S13) and as giving more weight to a result based on both the first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 1-7);

"a phrase determining section.....phrases" as comparing the phrases with a first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 48-59);

"a phrase dictionary....phrases" as dictionary (Fig. 3, subblock 151);

"said phrase dictionary....style transference" as dictionary being accessed for matching the corresponding phrases (Fig. 4).

As per claim 7, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized....phrases" as checking for parallel possibilities of phrase matching (col. 7 lines 45-51).

As per claim 8, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized.....word string" as a morphological analyzing section which transfers (col. 6, lines 30-42);

"word clustering.....part names" as analyzing and grouping according to part of speech (Col. 6 lines 43-65);

"said phrase extracting.....part of speech" as performing and extracting according to part of speech (col. 10 lines 34-64).

As per claim 9, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized in that said apparatus has a parallel translation....word clustering.....speech part names" as basing the part of speech replacement according to both part of speech and content (Col. 10 line 52 – col. 11 line 6; and Fig. 2, subblock L5).

As per claim 12, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized in that said phrase.....target language" as comparing the phrases with a first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 48-59) with a parallel comparison (Fig. 9, subblock S3)

As per claim 13, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized in that said apparatus has a perplexity calculating section.....perplexity" as multiple rules (col. 16 lines 1-30) wherein the matching is determined by the order of the part of speech, based on a bottom-up tree search.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutsumi et al (5353221) in view of Su et al (5418717).

As per claim 1, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"a language transferring....speech or text" as using semantic analysis (Fig. 2, L4) for translation (abstract)

"a language transferring section which transfer....section" as using the language rules (col. 7 lines 1-35)

As per claim 1, Kutsumi et al (5353221) does not explicitly teach a speech recognition system to output the results of the language processing, however, Su et al (5418717) teaches a language processing/translation (abstract) that performs speech recognition (col. 7 lines 34-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of language processing to modify the teachings of Kutsumi et al (5353221) with speech recognition because it would advantageously allow for the scoring output to be based on speech input (Su et al (5418717), col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 2)

As per claim 2, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized....style independent phrases" as level L6 semantic translation is independent (col. 5 lines 20-28).

As per claim 3, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches parallel or concurrent semantic rules for the independent phrases (Fig. 9, subblock S3; col. 5 lines 20-28).

As per claim 4, Kutsumi et al (5353221) does not explicitly teach a speech synthesis system to output the results of the language processing, however, Su et al (5418717) teaches a language processing/translation (abstract) that performs speech synthesis (col. 7 lines 34-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of language processing to modify the teachings of Kutsumi et al (5353221) with speech recognition because it would advantageously allow for the scoring output to be audibly heard (Su et al (5418717), col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 2).

As per claim 5, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

"characterized in that.....language rule group" as multiple rules (col. 10 lines 1-30) in which the rules are enforced by a tree search in a bottom-up manner;

"an optimum rule.....distance" as combining the results of buffer F+G into a combined set of rules (col. 6 line 35 – col. 7 line 65; Fig. 9, subblock 518 and 519).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see related art listed on the PTO-892 form.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
or faxed to:
(703) 872 9314,
(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (703)305-4089, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Doris To, can be reached at (703)305-4827. The facsimile phone number for this group is (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno
9/8/2004

SUSAN MCFADDEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER